

**BASIS FOR THE AMENDMENT**

Claim 1 has been amended as supported by paragraph [0219] of the published application (US 2005/0025903 A1).

Claims 12 and 13 have been amended as supported by Claims 12 and 13 as originally filed.

No new matter is believed to have been added by entry of this amendment. Entry and favorable reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this amendment Claims 1-15 and 17-18 will now be active in this application.

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Sellman for the helpful and courteous discussion with Applicants' Representative on January 9, 2008. During this discussion it was noted that the amendment of Claim 1 excludes an adhesive which requires an additional compound as a curing agent and thus overcomes the rejection over Reich.

Regarding Rigamonti it was noted that none of the components qualify as pressure-sensitive adhesives. Thus, there is no combination of a radiation-curable composition (I) and at least one pressure-sensitive adhesive (II).

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, as amended, in view of the following remarks.

The present invention as set forth in **amended Claim 1** relates to a mixture comprising at least one radiation-curable composition (I) and at least one pressure-sensitive adhesive (II);

wherein said mixture does not comprise an adhesive which requires an additional compound as a curing agent.

The rejection of Claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 11-12 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Rigamonti (EP 0966704) is respectfully traversed.

Rigamonti fails to disclose or suggest a mixture comprising at least one radiation-curable composition (I) and **at least one pressure-sensitive adhesive (II)**;

wherein said mixture does not comprise an adhesive which requires an additional compound as a curing agent.

Rigamonti et al disclose a radiation curable coating composition comprising a multifunctional (meth) acrylate (A) and a component (B) which is a divinylether and/or an epoxide.

According to the present invention, acrylates as well as vinyl ethers may serve as radiation curable compounds (see US 2005/0025903 A1, paragraph [0020]). Hence, the divinyl ether compound according to Rigamonti is not a pressure sensitive adhesive but a radiation curable component.

This can also be seen by comparing Example 2 and the Comparative Example according to Rigamonti: Both examples comprise the same multifunctional acrylates, Example 2 further comprises a divinyl ether. However, both examples yield a crosslinked film showing optimal adhesion (Rigamonti, col. 6, line 45 and col. 7, line 43). Hence, the vinyl ether compound according to Rigamonti has no influence on the adhesion and, thus, does not act as a pressure sensitive adhesive. This is, however, the problem to be solved by the present invention (see US 2005/0025903 A1, paragraph [0001]). Rigamonti provides no disclosure or suggestion that vinyl ethers act as an adhesive in coatings.

As an alternative Rigamonti discloses the use of epoxides as part of the composition. However, Rigamonti does not disclose any example with epoxides. Furthermore, an epoxide alone does not act as an adhesive, since epoxides always need another compound with an epoxide-reactive group to act as an adhesive (see US 2005/0025903 A1, paragraph [0219]). Such compounds have now been excluded from Claim 1 by the amendment.

Neither vinyl ethers nor epoxides according to Rigamonti act as adhesives and, hence, rejection of the present invention in view of Rigamonti be withdrawn.

Further, compound (C) of Rigamonti does not represent a pressure sensitive adhesive.

However, although compound (C) of Rigamonti is optional (see col. 2, line 55: from 0 to 20% by weight; and col. 3, line 47: "The presence of components (C) is not necessary") the coating exhibits "an optimal adhesion of the coating film" (col. 5, line 33 et seq.). This means that the adhesion of the coating according to Rigamonti is optimal regardless whether compound (C) is present or absent. In other words: The presence of compound (C) has no influence on the adhesion properties of the coating according to Rigamonti.

This can easily be shown by comparing Examples 1 and 3: Example 1 discloses a mixture without a compound (C) whereas Example 3 contains 10% of 2-hydroxyethylmethacrylate. However, both coatings exhibit optimal adhesion (col. 6, line 18

and col. 7, line 9), thus, the presence of compound (C) has no influence on adhesion of the coating.

In contrast, Rigamonti points out that the effect of compound (C) lies in its "**diluent and viscosity reducing power for the mixture**", col. 3, lines 51 et seq.

Thus, compound (C) according to Rigamonti acts as a reactive diluent but not as a pressure sensitive adhesive and Rigamonti fails to disclose or suggests that admixing an adhesive to a coating mixture may improve the adhesive properties.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 11-12 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Rigamonti (EP 0966704) is believed to be unsustainable as the present invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The rejection of Claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 11-15 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Reich (US 6,500,878) is respectfully traversed.

Reich fails to disclose or suggest a mixture comprising at least one radiation-curable composition (I) and **at least one pressure-sensitive adhesive (II);**

**wherein said mixture does not comprise an adhesive which requires an additional compound as a curing agent.**

Reich et al. (US 6,500,878 B1) disclose radiation curable coating compositions comprising an amine-modified acrylate resin (col. 2, lines 40 to 41 and 47 et seq.) together with **at least one polyepoxide** (col. 1, line 37 et seq.). The purpose of this combination is to provide a further curing mechanism further to radiation curing (so called "Dual-Cure" curing) as can be seen in the abstract and in col. 1, line 40 et seq.: "... and conducting at least partial

amine hardening of the polyepoxide compounds by treatment of above 50 °C." and col. 4, lines 3 et seq. This makes clear that the combination of epoxides and amine according to Reich is for the purpose of curing, not for providing a two-component adhesive.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 11-15 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Reich (US 6,500,878) is believed to be unsustainable as the present invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, is obviated by the amendment of Claims 12 and 13.

The objection of Claim 3 is traversed. "Of" is not redundant in the claim. Thus, this objection should be withdrawn.


This application presents allowable subject matter, and the Examiner is kindly requested to pass it to issue. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the claims or otherwise wish to discuss this case, he is kindly invited to contact Applicants' below-signed representative, who would be happy to provide any assistance deemed necessary in speeding this application to allowance.

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
NFO:KAG:  
(OSMMN 08/07)

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon

  
Kirsten A. Grueneberg, Ph.D.  
Registration No.: 47,297